



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/281,813 | 03/31/1999 | STEPHEN PALM | P17243 | 7668 | |
| 7055 | 7590 02/20/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE | | | NGUYEN, DUNG X | | |
| RESTON, V | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1,22101, | | | 2631 DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004 | 37 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application | No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | | | | | |
| | | 09/281,813 Examiner | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | PALM, STEPHEN | | |
| | | | | Art Unit | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication a | Dung X Ng | <u>-</u> | 2631 | | |
| Period fo | | | | | | |
| THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r | DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mail dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | I. 1.136(a). In no even pply within the statut d will apply and will ute, cause the applic | t, however, may a reply be tin ory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | |
| 1)🖂 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 | 1 August 2003 | | | | |
| 2a)□ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ 1 | This action is r | on-final. | | | |
| 3)□ | ince this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is osed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | |
| 4)🖂 | Claim(s) 2, 4, 5, 9 and 10 is/are pending in t | the application | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr | | | | | |
| 5) | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ | Claim(s) <u>2,4,5,9 and 10</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8)[| Claim(s) are subject to restriction and | or election red | quirement. | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | |
| 9) <u> </u> | The specification is objected to by the Examir | ner. | | | | |
| 10) 🔲 - | he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ acc | cepted or b) c | bjected to by the Exa | miner. | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to | the drawing(s) b | e held in abeyance. S | ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | |
| 11) 🔲 - | he proposed drawing correction filed on | is: a)⊟ ap _l | oroved b)⊡ disappro | oved by the Examiner. | | |
| | If approved, corrected drawings are required in r | reply to this Office | ce action. | | | |
| 12) 🔲 🗀 | he oath or declaration is objected to by the E | Examiner. | | | | |
| Priority u | nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | |
| 13)[| Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei | gn priority und | er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a |)-(d) or (f). | | |
| a)[| ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: | | | | | |
| | Certified copies of the priority document | nts have been | received. | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | |
| * S | Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International B ee the attached detailed Office action for a lis | Bureau (PCT R | tule 17.2(a)). | • | | |
| | cknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | | • | | | |
| a | ☐ The translation of the foreign language p cknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | rovisional app | lication has been rec | eived. | | |
| Attachment | | • | | | | |
| 2) Notica 3) Inform | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 31,32&35. | | (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | |
| . Patent and Tr O-326 (Rev | 0.4.0.4. | Action Summary | | Part of Paper No. 36 | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/281,813

Art Unit: 2631

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on July 18, 2003, have been fully considered but are most in new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of McHale et al. (US patent # 5,852,655). Claims 1, 3, 6 - 8, and 11 - 41 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McHale et al. (US patent # 5,852,655), and further in view of Gatherer et al. (US patent # 6,044,107).

Regarding claim 2, McHale et al discloses that a xDSL systems can be implemented (abstract), comprising:

Central Office of 14 of figure 1 (corresponding to a negotiation data transmitter), associated with a plurality of initiating devices (column 1, line 65 to column 2, line 15), that downlinks or transmits (column 6, lines 54 – 55) at least one carrier including first negotiation information bits (for digital communication, the information should be in bits) representing different high speed communication standard capabilities to a responding communication device (column 2, lines 16 – 29 and column 10, lines 52 – 66);

Application/Control Number: 09/281,813

Art Unit: 2631

- Modem 30 in subscriber 12s of figure 1 (corresponding to a negotiation receiver) associated with a plurality of initiating devices (column 2, lines 30 – 41), that receives (column 4, line 42) at least one carrier including information bits (for digital communication, the information should be in bits) representing different high speed communication standard capabilities of the responding communication device (column 2, lines 38 – 41 and column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 9); and

- Controller 80 of figures 2 & 3 (corresponding to a selector) for selecting an appropriate communication device from the plurality of initiating communication devices, in accordance with the responding communication device, to establish a communication channel (column 8, lines 6 – 37), the communication standard capabilities indentifying different xDSL standards (abstract), and of course, the transmitting and receiving negotiations must be occurred before establishing the communication link.

McHale et al. differs from the instant claimed invention that it does not state in controller 80 of figure 2 & 3 (corresponding to a selector), wherein the transmitted at least one carrier contains data related to a useable carrier allocation. However, Gatherer et al. teaches that the transmitted data comprising useable allocation information (column 14, lines 61 - 67 of Gatherer et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement Gatherer et al. into McHale et al. to provide that wherein the transmitted at least one carrier contains data related to a useable carrier allocation information for improving the communication system.

Regarding claims 4, the limitations are analyzed in the same manner set forth as claim 2.

Regarding claim 5, McHale et al. differs from the instant claimed invention that it does not show that wherein transmission characteristics of the transmitted at least one carrier is reconfigurable during a transmission operation in order to minimize interference with the neighboring receiving system. However, Gatherer et al. further discloses that wherein transmission characteristics of the transmitted at least one carrier is re-configurable during a transmission operation in order to minimize interference with the neighboring receiving systems (column 12, line 66 to column 13, line 22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2631

the art at the time of the invention was made to implement Gatherer et al. into McHale et al. to provide that wherein transmission characteristics of the transmitted at least one carrier is reconfigurable during a transmission operation in order to minimize interference with the neighboring receiving system for improving the communication system.

Regarding claims 9, the limitations are analyzed in the same manner set forth as claim 2.

Regarding claims 10, the limitations are analyzed in the same manner set forth as claim 5.

Contact Information

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung X. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Ghayour Mohammad H can be reached on (703) 306-3034. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

DXN

February 10, 2004